

Balinese Exchange: Replication and Reaffirmation of "The One"*

Andrew DUFF-COOPER**

It is fitting that the workman should use the tool, not the tool the workman; that the rider should guide and spur the horse, and not the horse the rider; . . . If in such matters as these . . . order is maintained, the result is harmony and beauty—but if the relations are reversed, the result is confusion, ugliness, and distortion.

Hermes

I

No study about "exchange" would be

* The present study is based on materials amassed during about 21 months field research in 1979–81 in Pagutan, western Lombok. For about 11 months I lived with Pedanda Gdé Madé Karang (Pedanda Gdé) and his local descent group at the Gria Taman, Pagutan Belatung; for the rest of the time I lived in the village (*kaklianan*) Baturujung headed by I Nengah Semer (Pak Semer). This work was funded by the now defunct Social Science Research Council of Great Britain, the Emslie Horniman Anthropological Scholarship Fund of the Royal Anthropological Institute, and by the Philip Bagby Fund, University of Oxford. It was conducted under the auspices of the Indonesian Academy of Sciences (LIPI) and the Universitas Mataram, Lombok. Thanks are due to my hosts and to these bodies for supporting my research. I am also obliged to Gerd Baumann, Rodney Needham, and the present journal's anonymous readers for helpful and encouraging comments on the first draft of the study. Below, "Balinese" refers to the Balinese of Pagutan unless it is specified or otherwise clear, "ideology" means ideas and values in social action, while "replication" is used in no sense that is "static" and/or "functionalist" [cp. Boon 1990: 65, 126] as the text and e.g. Duff-Cooper [forthcoming-b] demonstrate.

complete that did not refer to Mauss's *Essai sur le don* [1925; trans. 1954].¹⁾ This is not just because the *Essai* seems to have acquired many of the qualities of a "sacred text" for anthropologists [Parry 1986: 453]: by substituting the more neutral and abstract "exchange" for the denotative "gift," it has procured real benefits for social anthropology as ethnography, comparative studies, and academic instruction. Moreover, of course, *The Gift* addresses a topic of capital importance in all forms of life and to persons in society at all times everywhere. Thus Weiner remarks that if any society is to continue it must "reproduce and regenerate certain elements of value" [1980: 71]. These processes are more or less partially achieved through exchanges, which are "the common task on which (a) society rests" [de Coppet 1981:

** Department of Humanities, Seitoku University, 531 Sagamidai Matsudo-shi, Chiba 271, Japan
The revised manuscript was accepted in April 1991. The author passed away in August 1991.

1) Cunnison's translation of the *Essai* [Mauss 1954] is not entirely well done (see e.g. [Leach 1955]), but it suffices for the present purpose.

200].

These views, which I have relied on before [Duff-Cooper 1988a: 37 n.32], are echoed by Signe Howell in a recent important contribution to the literature about exchange. She writes that it “makes the world go round” [Howell 1989: 419]. Her study is of “ritual” exchanges, “all those exchange processes engaged in by the Lio which . . . are life-promoting and, as such, involve all members of the community, including the ancestors” [*ibid.*: 436 n.10]. It concludes [*ibid.*: 434–435] by suggesting that the fact that “exchange expresses the moral order of society and should be seen as a life-giving process—not (as) a reciprocal, time-specific act in which two things are exchanged by two individuals, but (as) ‘the movement of the whole society’ [Mauss]” has five important implications. These concern the “time element”: “The person or group who gives something may never themselves directly be the recipient of a return gift . . .”; and the fact that ancestors (or “the gods”) are legitimate exchange partners. What is given and whether there obtains a “demarcation” between it and its giver(s), further, must both be considered; and the nature of an exchange relationship is also to be examined (some Lionesse ritual exchange evince “‘between’,” others “‘uniting’” relations).

Some of these implications have their more or less tacit predecessors. Thus Lévi-Strauss’s consideration [1949] of matrilinear cross-cousin marriage views this way of exchanging women from one descent line to another as “indirect”:

women whom one line gives away are replaced by others but no line receives them from the line to which it cedes them. More recently Parry discusses Indian gifts that count as *dana*: here there is no direct return to the donor. In *dana*, moreover, the donor and his gifts are identified one with another [Parry 1986: 459–463].²⁾ Howell has it that the relationship between Lio people and things (things exchanged and inalienable wealth) is one of “participation,” a fusion of the identities of persons and things to some degree [1989: 426, 431]. This participation is operative at the moment of giving. It must also be operative at other times because it applies to inalienable things too. If, as therefore seems probable, “participation” is employed along the lines of Lévy-Bruhl’s use of the term [e.g. 1910: 78–80] then an affective element is added to the lack of categorical distinction. Mauss alludes to this when for instance he relates how a Trobriander feels and behaves when he possesses a *vaygu’a* which is ideologically in many ways akin to a person [1954: 22].

The role of the ancestors or the gods as legitimate exchange partners has also been identified before, by for example Plath [e.g. 1964] for Japan and by Covarrubias [1937] for the Balinese. Mark Hobart [e.g. 1980a] looks closely at goods and services exchanged among classes of Balinese people, and so does Gerdin [1982] whose main focus is services exchanged.³⁾

2) Cf. Needham’s remark [1987a: 132 contra Dumont 1982: 225] that as a comparative issue that there is always a patent categorical difference between persons and things is “just not true.”

3) Gerdin and Needham, incidentally, are in

So apart from the detailed ethnography Howell reports and her quasi-holistic style of analysing it,⁴ the main value of her study is that it brings together these important points. This is especially so as Howell's explication of the fact (as she has it) that "ritual exchanges may be 'between' as well as 'uniting' relations" [1989: 419] is not entirely convincing, for the following reasons.

The two modes of relation (let us call them) are explicated thus: "uniting" exchanges are those "where all those who participate in gift exchanges are constituted as parts of a whole." Instances are Lionese intra-clan and -village exchanges. In exchanges that purportedly evince the "between" mode, such as alliance relationships and exchanges between the living and the ancestors, the parties to them "remain opposed" [*ibid.*: 423].

In "uniting" exchanges, then, the parties come together and are made one ("corporate") by the exchanges. In the contrasted mode, the parties are distinguished one from another [*ibid.*: 435]. In each case, though, and not only in the unifying exchanges, the parties constitute "wholes" of different kinds before the exchanges take

place (as a result of exchanges that have taken place between them before). In the former, the parties are identified one with another; in the latter they are contrasted. In both cases, though, exchanges take place between the parties. Howell makes a cogent case for seeing intra-clan and -village exchanges as "unifying." This case can well be extended to her class of "between" exchanges where contrasted parties (the living and the dead, wife-givers and -takers) are reconstituted as unities (the village, the "ine ame/wata ane relationship" in which the parties to it "walk together for ever") [*ibid.*: 432, 428, 430].

What Sahlins seems not to have taken into account in *Stone Age Economics* [1974; cf. Howell 1989: 423], therefore, is that exchanges between opposed parties may also unite them. That the Lio, whose "social organisation (is) informed by an ideology of prescriptive matrilineal cross-cousin marriage" [*loc. cit.*], should make exchanges that have unifying or solidary consequences, though, is hardly surprising: alliance by intermarriage may be seen as the paradigm of the exchange system in systems of prescriptive alliance [Needham 1986: 168]; and Lévi-Strauss suggests that matrilineal cross-cousin marriage (asymmetric prescriptive alliance) "favours . . . integration of the group," "permits a great (. . .) organic solidarity" [1949: 558, 548]. All in all, it would be odd if Lionese exchanges could not be interpreted as uniting. That they can be does not mean (what is contradicted by the social facts reported by Howell) that they are not also "between"

↘ implicit accord. At the place cited in note 2 above, the latter contends (again contra Dumont [1982: 225]) that an exhaustive division between prestations and things is neither requisite nor even normal: "prestations can consist of services alone, so that they are themselves goods."

4) True holism in my view [cf. de Coppet e.g. 1981: 198, 202 n. 15] does not employ such epithets as "social," "cosmological," "ritual," "political" and "religious" [Howell 1989: e.g. 429, 426] even as a descriptive convenience.

relations.

In spite of this conceptual confusion Howell's essay is a useful reminder of issues that any study of exchange can helpfully consider, though I would not readily concede that they are among the "theoretical issues of exchange" to which she refers [1989: 419, cf. 436]. But as she points out [*ibid.*: 423] the Lio and their prescriptive system are just the kind of social organisation that is amenable to the treatment that she gives her materials. This is consonant in many if not all regards with the implications of us being "concerned with 'wholes', with systems in their entirety" [Mauss 1954: 77]. What renders them thus amenable is that in this kind of society there is a scheme of classification that is total. The question then arises, Are the injunctions and suggestions of Howell's study appropriate in the analysis of societies without marriage prescription, which are often said not to evince such classificatory thoroughgoingness [e.g. Barnes 1980: 93]? This question is addressed by reference to aspects of exchanges made by Balinese in Pagutan, western Lombok.

II

The Balinese generally are initially divided into two main classes that subsume, though not exclusively, everything in the Balinese universe: those that are essential and timeless (*niskala*) and those who are material and in time (*sakala*). The former include the ancestors and the higher gods, the latter are the living (*mertya*) of the

middle region (*madyapada*). These latter are concentrated, on Lombok, in the narrow central plain of the island and number about 50,000. The majority are agri- and horticulturists, and husbanders of water buffaloes, pigs, ducks, and fowl.

Each Balinese person is born into one of four estates (*varna*, *bangsa*). In descending order of fineness and purity these are Brahmana, Ksatria, Vesia, Sudra. Balinese born to parents whose union has not been purified by the rites of marriage (*ngantén*) are "illegitimate" (*astra*), a Sudra status marked primarily by loss of rights in commensality and inheritance. Each of the estates may be subdivided into named classes, which may or may not be ranked one against another. In Pagutan such subdivisions play very little part in people's lives.

In northern Gianyar, Bali, the estates "are not linked to particular occupations" [Howe 1989: 49]. On Lombok, by contrast, they are linked to kinds of occupations: Brahmana are Pedanda, "high priests," teachers, or follow other occupations such as village office officials (*pegawai kantor désa*) that involve neither any kind of violence nor manual labour for payment for others. Ksatria, the estate of the former rulers of Pagutan [Duff-Cooper 1986a], may become Pedanda but with restricted rights of officiation and to knowledge, government officials or military or police men, or again may take jobs that are non-manual. Vesia may be minor officials, business people, merchants, and such like. Sudra are labourers, either on their own behalf or for others. Many

Sudra are now major landowners (but see below), and/or owners of businesses such as factories, shops and stalls, or public transport, ranging from the very large to the very small. Vesia and Sudra may also become Pemankus, "priests" who look after and officiate in temples of different kinds. The three finest estates constitute the *trivangsa*, also Dalem, Insiders; Sudra are Jaba, Outsiders, and also *Anak* Bali, Balinese people. Insiders are finer and purer than Outsiders, and the occupations that each class follows are concomitantly finer and purer.

Balinese forms of life were before based on realms. Now they are based for most of the majority of people's purposes, as for our present purpose, in associated agglomerations (*désa*, *kelurahan*) of villages (*kaklianan*) and three *désa* temples. In all these *désa* except four on Lombok, Islamic Sasak predominate over Balinese and others heavily. *Kaklianan*, headed by a Klian and a Pemanku who deal with their jural and mystical affairs respectively, are mostly divided into territorially based agnatic descent groups (*seturunan*) split between a variable number of compounds. Each such group may have a *sanggah gdè*, a temple to which all its subdivisions are connected by agnation (for men and unmarried women) and by marriage (for married women members). All subdivisions also have a compound temple (*mrajan/sanggah*)⁵ to which all its members are connected more or less closely agnati-

cally or through marriage. In some villages in Pagutan, members of one or more of the three finest estates and Balinese people reside. Baturujung is Sudra only.

The Balinese terminology of relationships [e.g. Duff-Cooper 1984a: 486] implies relationships among the members of the various classes it discriminates. All the terms, but practically those at +3 to -2, may be used as forms of address and reference for anyone who relative to Ego is of the requisite relative age and where appropriate status and gender. (Cousin terms may be used referentially only however.) The terms, that is, do not define consanguineal connections but imply relationships concomitant with relative age and where appropriate status and gender. Where the terms can be qualified by what "we" call possessives like "my" (*titiangè/tiangè*) the relationships are defined by reference to relative closeness to very proximate origin-points (*kavitan*), such as the compound temple and a material married couple. Where they can not be, but obtain relative to more distant points such as the village, *désa*, or national temples, then the terms are also employed with a qualifier such as a personal name or a birth-order name, and in address. Space precludes exemplifying these assertions which have been argued elsewhere (above).

As far as marriage goes, various contingent factors (relative wealth, beauty, and actual age) enter into a man or a woman's choice of partner. Even if these matters are judged satisfactory, however, certain women are not permitted to men: those of a finer estate and of a generation prior to

5) Balinese evinces speech registers. Words given in this way are the fine/coarse (*alus/kasar*) forms.

the man's and certain closely related persons such as a man's sister and daughter. The marriage of opposite-gender twins, though, is a very fine marriage to contract. All other women are permitted to a man as a marriage partner, though some such as his father's brother's daughter are particularly favoured. The reciprocal exchange of two sisters by two brothers and their lines is disfavoured. One's mother's brother's daughter is also a fine marriage partner. (These matters are discussed in great detail in e.g. Duff-Cooper [1984a; 1986b; 1987a].)

Marriage unites a man and a woman who should reproduce and regenerate life. (Childlessness is one reason for divorce [Duff-Cooper 1987a: 52-53].) In this, a couple is like Ida Sang Hyang Vidhi, the high or highest god of the Balinese, "The One" (*Tunggal*), as for instance the bisexual icon *Ardhanārīśvara* from which all life derives [Duff-Cooper 1988b]. This icon consists of a female and a male aspect representative, like the married couple, of the united female and male principles, *pradhanapurusa*. These are also contrasted but they are in very many ways alike. But they are not so alike as to be identical (as they are when the two aspects of The One are devoid of contents as in Vidhi as *Sunya*, the Void [Duff-Cooper 1990b]). Marriage should unite a man and a woman who similarly are in many ways alike and more particularly are related such that the man is superior by relative age and, permissably, status. Marriages favoured by Balinese ideology achieve this in the finest ways (at least when

the man and the woman are of the same estate). The unions that would result from a man taking a prohibited woman would result in disorder and catastrophe not just for the couple but for the whole realm. Thus the penalties for contracting a disorderly marriage were severe until they were relaxed in 1921 [De Kat Angelino 1920: 32]. A disfavoured marriage, by contrast, such as the reciprocal exchange of two sisters by two men and their lines, results only in misfortune such as childlessness or chronic ill-health for the couple and their descent lines. These can be righted by a local medicine-man or -woman (*Balian*). A disorderly marriage, though, "would constitute an onslaught on the entire complex of . . . ordered relationships that are the society, and on the symbolic classification which is its ideological life" [Needham 1962: 99] (on Balinese symbolic classification see e.g. [Duff-Cooper 1985b; forthcoming-a]). No wonder that impoliteness, too, had dire consequences for its perpetrator [Swellengrebel 1951].

Marriage rites are among the class of rites (*upacara*, also *yadnya*: sacrifices) held for material people (*manusa*). This class of rites is one of five such classes that it is the duty of each local descent group to hold. The others are for demons (*bhuta*), uncremated souls (*pitra*), "priests" and perhaps what Mark Hobart [1978: 14] calls the pious (*rsi*), and gods (*déva*).

Everything these sacrifices involves, from the determination of when a rite is to be held and inviting people to attend (below) to the clearing-up afterwards, which in big

(*utama*) rites may be weeks and months after they are initiated, constitutes "work" (*karya/gaé*).⁶ "Work" also refers to the occupations mentioned above and others, and to cooking, washing clothes, and other domestic chores, looking after children, and the other myriad tasks of Balinese life. These tasks may be more mundane than the vast rites that some Balinese work, but they are nevertheless ritual, if anything is: like everything else in Balinese ideology they ultimately derive from and are to be related one to another and understood by reference to Vidhi, The One.

Work is contrasted, in these senses, with times when the Balinese "have fun" (*macanda-canda*; Ind. *main-main*). These are very few. They do not differ from work, though, in two ways: they may also be said to be ritual, if anything may (above); and they involve exchanges of goods and/or services for other goods and/or services and/or cash (i.e. Indonesian and very unusually foreign currency) (see also below, sec. IV). What is exchanged depends upon the context. Whatever the context, though, what is exchanged does not, expectably, comprise "exclusively goods and wealth, real and personal property,

and things of economic value." It also includes such things (pragmatically speaking) as courtesies and other language, entertainments, military assistance, dances and feasts [cf. Mauss 1954: 3]. Women and children may also be exchanged, as may good health, knowledge, the use of agricultural and other equipment, and palm-wine and coffee, betel and tobacco, and sweet-meats.

Feasts, say, are not of course exchanged for feasts, nor dances for dances, and so on. Rather, all those things constitute items of exchange. In the nature of Balinese life, in which like tends to seek out like through marriage and other kinds of alliance, including amical alliance,⁷ and in which such relationships are embodied in exchanges, it often happens that an accepted invitation to take part in a rite which includes entertainments, say, is reciprocated in the future by an invitation to a similarly elaborate and fine rite. But in Pagutan and particularly in Baturujung, the local descent groups of which differ extremely in their material circumstances, this is far

6) Any rite may be either small (*nista*), middling (*madia*), or large. Various factors are taken into account in deciding at which point on the scale a rite should be worked, and in assessing whether it was worked at an appropriate point on the scale. Prime among these are the estate of the holders of the rite and their affluence. Balancing the two is a sensitive business and is open to the kinds of manipulation described by Gerdin [1982: 151-158] and by Howe [1989: 67-69], both of which are deprecated by right-minded Balinese of all estates.

7) In what ways, if any, two entities are alike depends of course on the points of resemblance considered, which in turn depend upon the context of comparison and the purposes for which it is carried out. Hobart's early essay [1980b] on Balinese kinship and marriage, incidentally, is called *Ideas of Identity*; and he later suggests [1983] that Balinese marriages are a way of establishing likenesses. My view is that these must be established before a marriage is decided. Howe, by contrast, thinks [e.g. 1984: 219 n. 5] that the ideal spouse in Bali is a "person like oneself", though "sameness" is differentially interpreted as "'of the same title group', 'of the same village', even 'of the same wealth bracket'."

from always the case. Like relative wealth and beauty in marriage, such considerations are contingent to what can be called the system of exchange.

It is not feasible here to go into this system in all its details. Below, therefore, we examine some exchanges which seem to me at once typical of Balinese exchanges generally and amenable to close consideration from the angles of the five heads drawn together by Howell.

III

“*Punia*” refers to a present or gift, homage, and tribute that all have a duty to give to people of finer status than they such as Pedanda, who are mostly men but may be women, whose *dharma* does not allow them to labour or otherwise make their own livings. (Lesser Brahmana may labour on their own account though.) Those who stand in the relationship Sisia to a Pedanda—one in which s/he is Surya (“Sun”) to the Sisia for whom s/he performs mystical services at cremations and perhaps such other times as marriages—especially have a duty to present him with *punia* from time to time, above all when the Surya and his local descent group are holding rites. One may give *punia* as an individual (as I did in lieu of payment for board, lodging, and instruction); or one may give as a member of a local descent group. It is given to a Pedanda and/or to his wife either for his own use or to him or her as the most senior member of his “family” or local descent group. However, since a Balinese is who s/he is by virtue of the local descent group

and the other classes to which s/he belongs through birth and relationship to “origin-points,” an individual willy-nilly gives, and properly receives, as one of a number of people. These people are all vessels (*patra*) through which life of one or another kind lives itself out [Duff-Cooper 1985a: 82]. Those Balinese who give and receive are very often seniors. They thus have the authority to dispose of and to accept items of exchange without reference to others to whom they are closely related, except perhaps their wives or husbands.

“*Madana punia*” means to give *punia*. The phrase also refers to the giving of sustenance (*merta*) to needy inferiors by Pedanda—villagers told me that Pedanda Gdé’s father, now the Pedanda Bhatarā (Bhatarā: god, protector), used often to give *punia* to the poor, and rulers and high officials as were such as Perbekel [e.g. Geertz 1980: 54–60]. In giving, anyone should be generous and should do and be so willingly (*dharma alus dana goya*). The giver of *punia* is to expect nothing in return for the gift, and nothing may be directly returned for it. The giver should not even mention that s/he has given it: doing so wipes out any credit s/he may have acquired with the gods for behaving correctly. Nonetheless, the giver of *punia* is very likely to be looked on favourably by its recipient(s). This is in itself a gift from such people as Pedanda, as indeed it was from a ruler’s subjects, and those they represent.

When given to inferiors, *punia* usually consists of unhusked rice. When given to a Pedanda it may be either small (*alit*) or

large (*agung*). The former may consist of husked or unhusked, but never cooked, rice or anything else that is appropriate to the status: white cloth, tobacco, money, or a bottle of foreign whisky or brandy. *Punia agung* is given to Pedanda and their close relatives at such great rites as *mukur* or *maligia*, supplementary cremation rites for the very highest statuses, at which a Pedanda given may or may not be officiating. This offering includes white cloth, money, an umbrella, paper and pencil, an unused white cushion, incense, sandalwood, soap, a lamp, and scent. All signify the status. Before, also, when the Anak Agung ("King") of Pagutan held rites at which the descent group's "private" Pedanda (Patirthaan) officiated, the latter might be given up to two hectares of rice-fields by the King.

"*Punia*" also means information, *mapunia* (and *ngaturang* and *maturan*) to inform or report.⁸) This information is a gift to someone who should go out only on official business. One does so respectfully, refinedly, and deferentially, as one should do everything for such people. One also does so on one's own account (cf. above) or perhaps as the delegate of another or others.

The giving and receiving of *punia*, then, does not involve a direct exchange. On the one hand, this is perfectly proper because Pedanda have a right to support, especially from their Sisias, as a King's subjects have a right to sustenance from

him. On the other hand, "the gift not yet repaid debases the man who accepted it, particularly if he did so without thought of return" according to Mauss [1954: 63]. This kind of situation leads Mark Hobart [1980a: 58] to write that the Balinese gift, such as *punia*, has a "double-edged quality." One way out, for Pedanda at least, is to take just the *sari* of the gift—its immaterial content, often referred to as its "essence"—and to pass on the substance of the items given either as offerings to the ancestors and gods in the compound temple or as gifts to other people. Either way, he is likely to get some back, either as *lungsuran*/*paridan* after the gods have taken their *sari*, or as food. For Sudra given rice, it would have been hard for them to be further debased; and they would have many opportunities to return the gift: Both subjects of the supreme and of lesser ruling houses, *kawula* and *sepangan* subjects respectively, had to deliver goods and services to their rulers' military and other endeavours [cf. Gerdin 1982: 78].

But it is anyway not obvious that such an unreturned gift debases the person or people who receive(s) it. Where no return is expected it is not proper. Where it is not proper, a return would debase its giver. The asymmetry of the relationship need not be accompanied by a corresponding asymmetrical evaluation of the parties in all respects. Value and structure, after all, are not dependant one upon another [cf. Needham 1985: 55].

Before we consider the things given in *punia* more closely, it is convenient to introduce exchanges in which *daksina*

8) When *punia* is given, the expression accompanying it is *titiang maturan* (or *ngaturang*) *suksma*, I give thanks.

figure. *Daksina* may also be “small” or “big.” The former may consist of money, given in exchange for purifying holy water (*tirtha*), or of rice, betel-chewing ingredients, white cloth or a skein of white yarn, and money given to a “priest” when s/he makes medicines or otherwise treats more or less minor ailments. When someone is making equipment for use in cremations at least, too, s/he may make up a small offering of *daksina* which s/he sets down on the mat close to where s/he sits working, to the south. (“*Daksina*” also means “south.”) When the work is finished, the rice and money are thrown over the equipment to keep it pure and clean (*suci*) until it is used.

“Large” *daksina*, consisting of rice, a mature coconut, an egg, money, betel-chewing ingredients, white cloth, tobacco, and incense, must be given to a Balian when s/he is commissioned by someone or some group of people to make a *tumbal*, protective against left-handed magic [e.g. Hooykaas 1980]. While the *tumbal* is being made, “small” *daksina* is put close to where its maker is working.

Daksina, large or small, can be given by an individual or a group of people to another individual (with the provisoes already mentioned) or to non-material beings. Here though, there is a return: a *tumbal*, the hope of a restored state of health (i.e. a return of the fire, water, and air in the body to a balanced state), or a production process and its result(s) unencumbered by the mischievous, malevolent attentions of such material beings as witches (*léak*) and/or such immaterial

beings as “demons” (*bhuta*). (Both *léak* and *bhuta* are associated with south and are repelled by pure things and situations.)

More or less the same things are given in both small and large offerings of *punia* and *daksina*. The items given are “all representative of the status of Pedanda: the scholar, pure and clean, and sweet-smelling, who meditates daily for the good of the realm” [Duff-Cooper 1984a: 498]. But there is more to them than that: totality, represented by for example the married couple in its own house with a kitchen and ultimately by Vidhi in all its guises, is variously replicated in the items that constitute these offerings. It is represented by colours; the betel-chewing ingredients are the colours of the five gods, *panca dévata*; brandy and whisky are red, tobacco black, and with the white cloth are together the colours of the three gods (*tri purusa*) Brahma, Visnu, and Isvara (Siva) at south, north, and centre; the white and yellow of the egg (*brahmada*) are the colours of Isvara and Mahadeva at east and west; while white, also the colour of Siva, is “all” colours. It is also represented by the three layers of the mature coconut, and by each grain of rice as well as by money if it is *pipis bolong*. These are old round Chinese coins with a square hole at their centre. The hole may be seen as air. The round and square shapes of these coins and their air, with the tobacco and betel and the water of the coconuts, also constitute totalities. Totality is always life-promoting, supremely so in the *mantra OM*, the *ongkara*, constituted of the syllables *MAM*, *UM*, and *AM* of the three *purusa*.

Howell suggests [1989: 431] that the use of palm-wine and areca in Lio exchanges "underscores the transformational nature of ritual" because both have such properties on states of mind and consciousness. Perhaps this underscoring is operative in *punia* and *daksina* and indeed in almost all other Balinese exchanges in which palm-wine (*sajeng/tuak*) and/or coffee and betel and tobacco figure. It may also contribute to the acceptability of brandy and/or whisky in *punia*. Not only the transformational nature of these contents of these offerings may be significant, though, but also that they can be transformed: Hobart suggests [1980a: 54-55] that this is why money and rice (and one can add pieces of cloth and skeins of yarn, incense, and the other ingredients of *punia* and *daksina*) are highly valued and hence often constitute offerings or aspects of them. We may note, here, that The One, the primordial Vidhi, is a dichotomous Void, Sunya. Everything derives from Vidhi. Transformations of Vidhi constitute all aspects of the Balinese universe.

What is higher (or more to the right, the north, or east) is finer than what is lower (more to the left, the south, or west) in Balinese ideology [Duff-Cooper 1984b]. Consonantly, Hobart suggests [1980: 56 ff.] that because rice grows higher than root crops, by definition, it is more highly valued than they (which, though, may also be given as *punia*). Clearly Hobart is on to something here, and suggests another reason why coconuts and fruits are constant items of exchange. Their colours and their connections with water, a prime symbol in Balinese ideology, further contribute to

their value.

It would be incorrect, though, to say that there is no demarcation between these items of exchange and the people giving them. There is, but neither the persons giving them nor the things they give are what "we" consider persons and things to be. Differences and similarities among the former and the latter are established by reference to the same ideas: relative fineness and purity, relative position. In the social evaluation of both, moreover, matters that "we" do not perhaps judge should be relevant in the evaluation of people (colour, smell, birth, and all they imply to the Balinese) are significant in Balinese ideology to the evaluation of persons and things. Not only are persons substantially different for the Balinese from what "we" consider them to be, but so also are things. It is in these senses that in Balinese ideology "things are related in some degree as persons and persons in some degree as things" [Howell 1989: 419]. Whether it would be appropriate to describe this relationship as one of "participation," with its affective connotations, as a relative fusion of persons and things, or as a lack of demarcation between them, is doubtful: enough is here said by the social facts alone.

This raises another matter, concerning money. This was said to be highly valued. Its evaluation is evinced partly in the exchanges of money (alone or with other prestations) mentioned. Hobart describes ways in which money purifies through the market [1980a: 54-55].⁹⁾ Yet as *artha* it

9) "Food, including rice and its products, which has been offered to deities . . . has very restricted

ranks lowest of the three paths (*varga*) or the *trisakti*, *dharma*, *karma*, and *artha* [Duff-Cooper 1985a: 77 Table 2; cp. Hobart 1985: 125]. Pedanda and the pious, especially, but really no-one should be overly interested in making and/or accumulating it, though it is recognised as being as it has “always” been a necessity of life [cf. Gerdin 1982: 204].

What does this mean? At the least it means that money is ambivalent [cf. Hobart 1980a: 55]. This is consonant with ways of getting it ranging from theft to labouring to *punia* and *daksina*. What it does not only mean is that people cannot live without it. True, they cannot live elaborately; but they can, and do, live, if demeaningly. When people have money, its disposal is or should be decided by reference to a set of priorities which in my experience is generally ascribed to: holding rites, especially for “dead” but uncremated forebears, refurbishing the compound temple and then the buildings in the compound, discharging obligations to the material living; and only then attending to own perceived needs.

These priorities suggest that the sacrifices and such rites as the giving of *punia* and *daksina* and prime among what gives life, as all other forms of totality from *OM* to

the Pedanda/Sisia relationship are life-giving. Forms of totality and aspects of different forms may be differentially evaluated. It is not helpful, though, to say that this relative evaluation is an instance of hierarchy. This characterisation leaves out of account that ranking (relative evaluation), like water, cardinal points, colours, scents, and so on, is itself a symbolic resource [cf. Needham 1981: 86]; and that relative evaluation can be symbolised horizontally.¹⁰⁾

IV

One of the ways in which people make money is through “work,” to be understood in the present section mainly as the occupation(s) they follow as a matter of “sacred duty” (*dharma*). Thus Pedanda are given and receive and may also ask for *punia*; *daksina agung* is obligatory in the circumstances described. Kings also received tribute as holders of *dalem*, “inside,” rights in land from others who held “outside” use rights in the land (*druwé jaba*) (see e.g. [Lieftrinck 1900; *Adatrechtbundel* I 1910: 146–183] for details). Both have a duty to give back goods to those in need, and to pass on a major part of what they receive to the gods and their ancestors

↘ use value and is classed as a form of garbage. By being sold it regains its previous status, for it is said to be ‘purified by the market’, that is any exchange for money.” By contrast in Lombok, left-over offerings are highly valued at least by people related to the gods from which they are received back, and are never sold. Brahmana *lungsuran* are sought after by e.g. the local descent group’s Sisía as life-promoting.

10) By “hierarchy” is meant the standard English and French definition: an organisation of grades or classes ranked one above another in a series. Howell, incidentally, characterises Lio “social and religious organisation” as “hierarchical.” As the slaves, the third main class of this so-called hierarchy, appears no longer to exist, it is questionable whether the characterisation is exact and helpful in the analysis of present-day Lio life [Howell 1989: 425, cp. 436 n. 4; Needham 1987a: 128].

for the good of the realm. There is thus something to be said in this regard for Geertz's view [1980: 15] that in Balinese ideology "power serves pomp" Those who *madruvé jaba* might as today work land themselves, employ others to do so, either alone or with what for convenience will be called the owners of the rights, or rent the land to others who would work it themselves or with others on different kinds of terms.

The reason for writing that "owners of rights" is used for convenience is that no group of people, not even rulers, owned or owns land, nor does "rights in land" properly describe the relationship between an "owner" and the land he "owns." Nor do the gods own the land [Belo 1953: 1; cf. Gerdin 1982: 215]. Rather, the land, the rice and other things growing and living in and on it, and the water and sun that sustain them, are gods or representatives of the gods [e.g. Duff-Cooper 1989: 130]. People do not own these gods (how could they?). They stand in relationships of differing closeness (e.g. "inside" and "outside") to them. Thus what are for convenience referred to as the owners of rights in land are trustees (Penunggu, perhaps) of the relationship that holds between their local line of descent (ancestors, uncremated dead, the living, and those to come) and these gods. All except those to come are implicated in the main agricultural work of growing rice in irrigated fields.

The living, though, work the land, and may labour for themselves no matter their estate or, if they are Sudra, for others. Where they work for other people, they can

do so in various ways. The most important of these ways are: as junior members of the local descent group related to an area of worked land; as full-time helpers of another descent line; as wage labourers contracted to carry out a particular task or certain tasks; or in the context of an agreement with one or more members of a descent line to assist one another in their fields for a stipulated period reciprocally.

Labour is thus an item of exchange. It does not initiate a series of exchanges which will be seen to continue for longer or shorter periods. Employers, rather, or their representatives initiate relationships in which labour is given in exchange for employment and other things.¹¹⁾

Employment is considered a gift [cf. Gerdin 1982: 209–211]. It can be more or less elaborate. A full-time helper may be more or less permanently incorporated into the sub-line of non-agnates and in this capacity (*anak akon*, *pengangon*) receives the various forms of material and other assistances a junior member of such a group can expect. These extend to marriage and perhaps cremation rites, or financial and/or other contributions to them; or a helper may be less closely employed and receive concomitantly less assistance. Wage labourers may be paid in cash and be given food (cooked rice and meat and/or fish and vegetables), drink (coffee and/or palm-wine), and tobacco and betel. If they are

11) Hobart's scheme [1980a: 56 Dia. I], in which A gives labour to the land which gives crops to its owner who rewards A, does not figure in explications of exchanges between employers and employees in west Lombok.

helping at the harvest they are usually given a proportion of the crop [Duff-Cooper 1989: 142], and perhaps food, etc., too. This agreement may last for a season (90–100 days) or it may be task-based. An invitation to assist at the harvest for, say, a day may be accompanied by gifts of unhusked rice. More usually, only food and drink and the diversion of the lively (*ramê*) occasion are given to those who accept. The agreement called *maselisi* involves a direct exchange of labour and the usual food and drink between two men or groups of men who may be agnates, *masebau*, an exchange of equipment and draught animals [cf. Hobart 1980a: 139–148]. In all cases, labour is exchanged for goods and services or for goods alone, including cash.

Where a group of people work for themselves, however, they also give labour in exchange for a good harvest bestowed by the ancestors and other higher gods in the compound and village temples and in the fields. (Equally, those who give employment, etc., and receive labour in exchange depend upon the good will of their ancestors and gods for a bountiful harvest.) Before considering these relationships and the exchanges that embody them, what has so far been said in this section requires further examination.

The employer/employed relationship and the others described express totality: the parties to the relationships are, of course, exhaustive in the contexts in which they are related. Also, the goods and services that embody the relationships express totality, severally and singly. They do so severally by way of, e.g., the passivity as it were of

the gods and the activity of the living; of the food and drinks that people consume, together or separately: the white of rice, the black and red of coffee and palm-wine, for instance. They do so singly, e.g.: labour is a combination of the essential and the material; the betel-chewing ingredients already discussed. This was expectable: rice-growing as a process, from planting seed in the nursery beds and the rite of *nuasên* to storing the rice (*mantenin padi*), and aspects of this process replicate Vidhi in all kinds of ways [Duff-Cooper 1987c; 1989]. Moreover, while the exchanges are “between” the parties to them, they also unify them: each party as defined in and by the exchanges requires the other, at least as things presently are; the exchanges between them at once bring them together and make them one (as Lionese wife-givers and -takers (above) may be seen as one); but the parties are also contrasted with one another.¹²⁾

Each of the parties to the exchanges of course contributes to the relationships they embody. In some exchanges, the parties are differentially evaluated such that the exchanges evince asymmetry. In others, what goes for one party goes for the other(s) in those contexts such that the

12) These remarks led one vehement critic, who must remain anonymous, to comment: “Since when did exchange between employer and employee ‘unite them’. . .?” This is a good example of the deleterious effects theory can have on the appreciation of social facts [cf. e.g. Duff-Cooper 1991b chap. 3: sec. I] and brings to mind Feyerabend’s characterisation of “the theoretical approach” as “conceited, ignorant, superficial, incomplete, and dishonest” [1987: 25].

exchanges are symmetrical (cf. n.17 below).

Land, not unnaturally in the light of what is said about it reported above [and cf. Hobart 1980a: 88], is valued more highly than labour. Those closely related to the land are concomitantly more highly valued than those who work it, though Gerdin's description [1982: 207] of employer/employed relationships bears hardly any resemblance to those I experienced in Baturujung where people are at pains to flatten out (to use a phrase employed by Dumont [1982: 222]) differential evaluations.

Closeness to centres is more highly valued than distance from them. This principle is evinced in particularly favoured Balinese marriages, for instance, and in the social fact that kings held "inside" rights in land (cf. above), Sudra only ever "outside" rights. Similarly, workers unrelated to "owners" of land are paid x , say, for their labour while workers related to them may be paid $2x$ and $3x$ for the "same" labour [Duff-Cooper 1987b]. The higher the payment is, the more closely related are employee(s) and employer(s). Where juniors and seniors of a local descent group labour together on their own or others' land, in harvesting teams, in *anak akon* relationships, and in *maselisi* and *masebau* agreements, the relationships between the parties evince symmetry or only a very slight asymmetry. Usually, both parties to such relationships are closer to a centre than the parties to relationships such as a day labourer and his employer have that evince greater asymmetry. The former are relationships expected to continue,

but the latter are not [cf. Hobart 1980a: 139], having to be renegotiated anew each time they are entered into.¹³⁾

Is there a patent categorical distinction between the parties to the relationships and what each contributes to them? As far as giving employment goes, this like the possession of much knowledge or many children suggests that the local descent group of which the givers are a part is of means. Such a group has been favoured by the gods. Getting employment when needing to, like winning a bet, suggests as much. Both suggest that one's group have lived a life proper to its status (*patra*) as this is conceived at that time (*kala*) and place (*désa*). As for labour, this is an aspect of a labourer's duty, it was noted. That one needs to labour suggests that one is less favoured than an employer. Why this is so may depend on one's forebears having behaved well, too well, so that they lost their wealth and can no longer attend to the gods or not well enough so they did not acquire the means to attend to them [cf. Gerdin 1982: chap. 6]. That things have turned out thus, though, like losing at gambling, is not to be moped over and complained about [cf. Duff-Cooper 1990e: 21]. One is fortunate that one *can* labour so that *wénten sangu*, "there's enough": many on Lombok do not have nor are able to acquire *sangu*.

So employment and the rest that is given and the labour returned are not fused with

13) Cf., also, Barth [1974: 369]: "Symmetry is closely related to absence of change. . . and . . . to stability in the material world of facts and things."

their respective donors. Nonetheless, what an individual or group has and how s/he or it employs it reflect upon them. People are judged and evaluated in terms of “personal” merits and attributes [cp. Howe 1989: 50], and what they have and how they use it contribute substantially to the way such judgements and evaluations go. Their results, moreover, are cast in terms of fineness and coarseness that link one group of people and things to other such groups. Ideas about why people have what they have and why they do what they do with it differ markedly from “ours.” A major difference is that the ancestors and other gods and people’s relationships with them play a large role in deciding what people have, the configuration of the three qualities (*tri guna: sattva, rajah, and tamas*), also aspects of Vidhi, why they do what they do with it [Duff-Cooper 1985a: 69–70]. More widely they decide whether people are “to live a complete life and be happy” [Bosch 1960: 63] which is what “immortality” (*amrita*) originally signified [*ibid.*: 62]. “Contemporary peasant Balinese seem remarkably faithful to ancient usage” [Hobart 1980a: 62], especially when “*amrita*” is taken to mean “undead” [e.g. Hocart 1933: 136]: Balinese *amerta* (also *merta* and *amrita*) refers to for instance holy water and to rice, both of which are goddesses (Gangga or Sarasvati, Sri) prime among givers and promoters of life in Balinese ideology.

V

Howell writes that “ancestors (or ‘gods’)

may be the source of life”: “it is, therefore, not sufficient to attribute ancestors with powers to sanction human behaviour, the role usually associated with them in the anthropological literature”; “they must also be attributed with the ultimate power over the continued renewal of life. In this way, the ancestors become legitimate partners in exchange . . .” [1989: 434].

As pointed out earlier, the substance of these suggestions has long been recognised as obtaining to a proper understanding of Balinese ideology. As Mark Hobart says [1986: 25 n.8; cf. Duff-Cooper e.g. 1985c; 1988c; 1990b], “Divinity . . . orders all aspects of the human condition as well as the non-social world.” Moreover, the realm of the gods and ancestors is “a higher intelligible region or a transcendental metaphysical reality, where symbolic truths can be perceived . . .” [Angela Hobart 1986: 312; cf. 1983]. Clearly one cannot ignore the Balinese gods and ancestors if like Balinese people one wants the results of one’s labours to be complete and happy.

No matter which its estate, a local descent group, usually represented by its senior and other women, gives offerings daily, as soon after sunrise as is practicable or just before dusk, to its ancestors and the other gods in its compound temple and to their low counterparts at the centres of the compound temple and the compound and at gateways, either on the ground or in niches in gateposts, both outside the compound. Offerings may also be given to the beings associated with the fires in kitchens, and at wells and springs. Every fifth day (*kliwon*) of the five-day week, larger and more offer-

ings are given in the compound temple. Sudra women villagers also make offerings to be given to the village ancestors in the village temple where the temple priest(ess) also makes daily offerings to the Bhatara there. On various other days such as temple festivals (*odalan*), *tumpêk* which come once every thirty-five days, days in the agricultural cycle, when houses and other constructions are completed or when "new" machinery is acquired, offerings are made wherever appropriate and to the ancestors and gods in the compound and/or village temples and to their low counterparts. Moreover, when one of the rites of one of the five sacrifices mentioned earlier is held, offerings are made and given to the ancestors and their low counterparts. "Many Balinese laughingly but proudly referred to themselves as crazy with offerings . . ." [Gerdin 1982: 51].

The simplest offering phenomenally is the *canang*. "*Macanang*" (*/nyedah*) means to chew betel. The *canang* like the betel-chewing ingredients discussed earlier describes totality through the ordered assemblage of red, yellow, green, black, and white leaves and flowers. These are the colours of the five gods Brahma, Mahadeva, Visnu, Isvara, and Siva at south, west, north, east, and centre respectively. Offerings such as *caru* for the low spirits mimic the *canang* but in reverse and much more elaborately. *Ngejot*, small amounts of rice (or "any type of food" [Howe 1984: 209]) on small pieces of banana leaf are also given to these spirits after the first rice of the day has been cooked. Liquid (water, soft drinks, or palm-wine) always

accompanies an offering.

At bigger rites, offerings are multiplied: more kinds are given and more of each, more beverages served, and the language used when giving them is more ornate, probably involving old Balinese and Javanese and Sanskrit [cf. Duff-Cooper 1990c; forthcoming-a].

Nonetheless, the exchanges between the people holding a rite and the ancestors and gods and their low counterparts are always in their essentials the same. The former give food and other necessities to the latter, and these all represent totality. The latter take the *sari* of the offerings and give them back to their donors, when asked to do so. They then consume them perhaps with others who through relationship or custom consume one another's left-over offerings [Gerdin 1981]. Being properly attended to, the gods and ancestors also look to the best interests of those who honour them.

Others exchange things in ceremonies. The low spirits, being satisfied, do not trouble people in the very many ways they can if they are ignored or treated peremptorily. The offerings given to them are not asked for back, though, but are generally eaten by dogs and fowl, associated with lowness and with the opposites of right-mindedness and -conduct. If a "priest" officiates, s/he and helpers, if any, are rewarded for their mystical services with large offerings of cooked and/or uncooked rice, other food-stuffs, drinks, and other goods including money.

Finally, the owners of a ceremony exchange goods with other people. Those who are invited to help prepare food for

large ceremonies [e.g. Duff-Cooper 1985d: 125–134] are rewarded for their labour and for their contributions to them (e.g. husked rice, coffee and/or sugar, palm-wine and perhaps *arak*, or exceptionally perhaps a pig, chickens and/or a duck or ducks) with a large, formal feast of rice, pig meat, and vegetables, much alcohol, and coffee, sweetmeats, and betel and tobacco and cigarettes. Others may attend just the rites (*ngebening*) and be served coffee, palm-wine, and cakes in return for their attendance; others again may be asked just to call in when Gerdin reports [1982: 186], “nothing will be served.”¹⁴ People who are invited but are unable to be present for some very pressing reason are often sent gifts of food. These gifts are usually returned offerings (above), food made for such people as Pedanda but not eaten, or food not consumed at the feast. Women attending the rites and the preparations for them bring food back home with them. All these classes of guests may be entertained with music and perhaps dancing, by a performance of the relatively new *derama* genre [e.g. A. Hobart 1986: 303–305, 309–310], a shadow-play, the Sasak *jepung*, or other performance. All of these make the rites bigger and finer and like betel, tobacco, and alcohol may have transformational properties (as Stephan [1990] argues pictures can). Bargains may be struck, news and gossip relayed, liasons tacitly established.

All these exchanges are “between” the

various parties involved but also bring them together as wholes of greater and lesser extension. They are mostly not one-off exchanges, but are expected to continue as one local descent group after another (as it were) hosts occasions for them. The classes of people and the gods, ancestors, and demons are not expected to change, though in time their empirical constituents of course will: people die and after cremation become ancestors and very exceptionally higher gods (like Pedanda Gdé’s late father, the Pedanda Bhatarā) or demons (as a very well-known and knowledgeable Brahmana witch is widely expected to do). Someone will replace Pedanda Gdé one day, as he replaced his father when he died; and “avoidance” relationships may for one reason or another be instituted between two or more individuals and/or groups of people.

As for the goods and services given and received, there does not again appear to be a fusion between them and their donors, except that as seen in section IV above, what a local descent group has reflects on what it is. In the case of offerings returned to their donors by the ancestors and higher gods and the uneaten parts of a Pedanda’s meal, distinctions are made: the first may not be eaten by non-members of the *sidikara* of those holding the rites (“*sidikara*” perhaps deriving from “*sidi karya* . . . ‘one work’ or ‘to work together’, ‘work’ (*karya*) used here in the sense of staging ceremonies” [Gerdin 1982: 45]); the second and third may be consumed beneficially by anyone. Clearly two ideas have here come together: people of the same

14) Usually something (coffee, betel, and tobacco at least) is served to guests, but perhaps not in Karang Sari.

kind, e.g. a *soroh*, agnates by reference to a particular origin-point, should stick with people of their own kind (i.e. like with like again); and what is higher is finer than what is lower, and the two can or should not be placed so that what should be higher is subordinated to what is lower. (Similar situations are that those of a higher estate do not honour the gods in the compound temple of a less fine, lower, local descent group unless there is a seat of the very high god Surya, the Sun, (*padmasana*) in the temple; that only those junior "in kinship terms (and of the same *sidikara*) can pay respect to a deceased ancestor" [*ibid.*: 43]; that women do not usually get on top when having sex with a man; and that children never, in my experience, turn cartwheels or stand on their hands.)

These instances of asymmetry, which is very frequent but not thoroughgoing in Balinese ideology, are paralleled in the exchanges just described: those holding the rites give far more in these exchanges than any of the other parties materially [cf. Duff-Cooper 1984a: 498 n.9]¹⁵; a Pedanda or other officiant gives far more mystically than all other people; and the gods and ancestors give the holders of the rites good fortune, or do not give them bad, as the demons do not. The people holding the rite should give as they can. In the nature of the distribution of wealth among the (male) members of a local descent group, and assuming that its seniors

behave as they should, their contributions to the rites are likely to be symmetrical or nearly so.

VI

"Inalienable wealth" should be shortly considered before we conclude. While I was in Pagutan I came across only a very few things that might constitute such wealth. (The present section discusses just two for reasons of space. Not included are some *gringsing* cloths [e.g. Ramseyer 1975].)

Pedanda Gdé, for instance, told me that he had often been approached to sell the 14th century palm-leaf manuscript *Nagarakrtagama* that he and his local descent group are said by him and (some but not all) others to possess. He said he had, of course, always refused to part with it: it could never be disposed of. Pak Semer, too, once showed me a large gold coin, a *ringgit*, dating from the reign of Queen Wilhemina of the Netherlands. This also could never be sold or otherwise leave the possession of his local descent group.

Everything else, including a compound and its temple and the most secret knowledge (*aje were*) can be permanently exchanged for money, i.e. "sold" (*madol/madep*) or used to pay off a debt, or in some cases temporarily exchanged for money (*magadé*, "pawned"). It therefore seems to me that what Pedanda Gdé and Pak Semer each said may or may not hold *in extremis*, but points to something else, namely that these two things are different.

15) "The wedding of my friend I Wayan Care to his first cousin (FBD) was reckoned to be small: there were about 320 guests and the ceremonies (exchanges) cost about Rp. 244,000."

The *Nagarakrtagama* is by any standards very ancient; indeed it is one of the most venerable extant forms of one of the highest of mystical beings, Sarasvati. It is treated like a god, only brought down from the high shelf in the northeast of the inside, inside room of the Pedanda and his wife's living quarters where it is kept and given offerings, I understood, on the most special of occasions (e.g. Sarasvati's day, Saniscara Umanis Watugunung), and then it is boxed. I was not shown the *lontar* though I gathered that Liefrinck might have been. (This probably reflects his elevated and my lowly status (*astra* (above)) [cp. Hendry 1989: 628].

Pak Semer's *ringgit* was also treated reverentially, stored on the highest shelf of the cupboard in the northeast corner of his and his wife's living quarters in the inside room, wrapped in white cloth. Gold, one form of Bhataras Sedana, is associated conceptually with food (*rayunan/nasi*, "cooked rice") [e.g. Howe 1980: 179]; and in an "agricultural" rite *nyinah* (from *sinah*, light, clear) Sedana and Sri, the rice-goddess, are married to one another.¹⁶⁾ Gold also figures in different rites for ensuring and making water in for instance dry wells. It is thus life-giving. Knowledge is too: "Traditional" knowl-

edge and ritual can lead to eternal life, *moksa*, freedom from rebirth and (re-)union with Vidhi; higher "modern" knowledge can lead to high status and the prestige and wealth that go with it. These associations and the venerableness of the objects suggest that for their "owners" and perhaps also for others, these objects are even finer, purer, and sustaining than "ordinary" *lontars* and gold.

Pedanda Gdé and Pak Semer are "old"—the former because of the status he occupies, the latter because he is aged (and learned and wealthy)—but it would not be right to say that either is of the status of "his" object. It would be to reduce Sarasvati and Sedana too much to suggest that they were fused with their respective possessors, even though Pedanda Gdé, at least, is a daily vessel for Siva who makes holy water each morning [e.g. Hooykaas 1966]. Nonetheless, I think that the Pedanda and Pak Semer "participate" in their objects (or the objects in them) in this sense: the very close relationship of each with "his" object reflects on them and their local descent groups, and renders them different from other such groups to the degree that their objects differ from other such objects. For Pak Semer at least, also, the pleasure that he plainly derived from showing me the *ringgit* and the ways in which he admired and extolled its beauty, were much akin to the affective aspect of participation described by Mauss referred to earlier (sec. I). Perhaps the Pedanda also felt so but it is unbecoming for such a personage to take overt pleasure in possession.

16) Cf. Hobart [1986: 9]: "In Tegallalang the relation of Sang Hyang Widi to its creation is often expressed in a metaphor of light. Souls are its *sinah*." Cp. Duff-Cooper [1985c: 15]: "The soul (atman) . . . which animates all human beings and other living things such as certain stones (*arca*) and the holy water sprinkler(lis) . . . is to Vidhi as sunlight is to the sun-god, Bhataras Surya."

VII

The summary consideration of these typical Balinese exchanges leads to a number of findings. Exchanges that material and essential Balinese people and other classes of being make by virtue of who they are may be "time specific," but they are generally not. Even those exchanges which might seem time specific are probably not: the givers of *daksina agung* in exchange for a *tumbal* or for hoped-for good health are probably either related in some way to the receiver of the offering; or else, particularly if the *tumbal* and the treatment given procure the desired results, these exchanges initiate a relationship in which giver will have recourse to receiver in the future and perhaps even become his or her Sisia (if the latter is a Pedanda).

The role of the ancestors and higher gods and their low counterparts in Balinese ideology as exchange partners is also confirmed and further explicated above. But the Balinese do not see them as such. They are, rather, an integral part of their form of life with whom people have relationships that are embodied in and recreated by the exchanges. These relationships are "not distinguished as matters for questioning" [Needham 1981: 77].

The exchanges that embody these relationships are made "between" the parties to them, but they also make these parties one. As mentioned above (sec. I), that relationships are "between" parties which are contrasted one with another does

not mean that they do not also unite the parties. To the contrary, they are united by the exchanges being between them.

The items given in Balinese exchanges, moreover, are total social facts in Mauss's sense: they have what "we" call economic, political, juridical, moral, aesthetic, religious, mythological, and socio-morphological aspects, though these are not distinguished by Balinese ideology which does not employ such distinctions in its classification of phenomena.

A distinction that it does employ is between "things" that are animated by Vidhi and those that are not. This exhaustive classification, in which the former live (*idep*) but the latter do not and are *padem*, renders some things categorically more akin to persons than others. But in my judgement there does not obtain a fusion between the parties to an exchange and what they exchange as Howell suggests obtains among the Lio. Nonetheless, it has been described how what a person and a group of people has to exchange and whether s/he or they do so as required by the conventions (*krama*; Ind. *adat istiadat*) of Balinese life in Pagutan reflects what kind of people the parties are. In the case of the Pedanda and his local group's *lontar* and Pak Semer and his group's *ringgit*, the nature of the objects is such as to make them inalienable, in normal circumstances at any rate. It was suggested that these objects, by virtue of their venerableness, are even more life-promoting than other such objects.

All the items exchanged are life-giving and -promoting. What "life" consists of varies in different forms of life and changes

through time. But that the Lio and the Balinese and, one might say, all forms of life expend so much time and effort in the attempt to keep alive is hardly surprising: "Keeping alive is man's greatest occupation, the ultimate spring of all his actions" [Hocart 1933: 133]. In the Balinese case, to put it very summarily, "life" is Vidhi. Life is promoted by replicating Vidhi as all things are transformations of and replicate Vidhi. Vidhi is totality: the items exchanged express this totality. Totality is not replicated and reaffirmed in these items alone. It is also replicated and reaffirmed by the symbolic resources (e.g. water, blood, lateral values, cardinal directions, elevation, scents, colours, language and other sounds, movements, and so on) that appear and reappear in all exchanges and in all aspects of Balinese life [cf. e.g. Duff-Cooper 1988c]. It is also expressed in the repetition of the exchanges in all other forms of Balinese life, if allowance is made for *désa kala patra*, i.e. for what is taken to be appropriate at one place and time by one group of people perhaps not being so by the same group at a different time, or by other groups at the same or different times in different places. It is further expressed by the employment of the same symbolic resources in these exchanges to express the same ideas. These ideas, most generally, are that everything derives from and is contained in Vidhi, and that Vidhi is pervasive (*sarvagatah*) in all forms of Balinese life. It might therefore be said without forcing interpretation that Balinese exchanges in, say, Pagutan are life-promoting in that they

"involve all members of the community (sc. the Balinese people), including the ancestors" [Howell 1989: 436 n.10]. This is especially so when "the average Balinese is . . . aware of the variety of rules, ritual, and style" in different forms of Balinese life [Gerdin 1982: 23].

Wholes in Balinese ideology are divided mainly into from two to eleven aspects. These aspects may be related symmetrically and/or asymmetrically, and by one of the three modes of transitivity and of reflexivity.¹⁷⁾ These relations may be represented as holding horizontally (as in the courts of a temple), vertically (as in a seat of Surya and other such physical structures as a house or pavilion), or in both planes (as in the eleven points—eight horizontal, two vertical, and one horizontal and vertical—of the complete Balinese compass). The

17) "Perfect symmetry" describes the relation that holds between two entities that are interchangeable in any context whatever, "symmetry" the relation between entities that are interchangeable in some of those contexts, and "asymmetry" the relation that holds between entities that are not interchangeable in particular contexts. The same entities may be related symmetrically or asymmetrically. In the latter case, in some contexts one entity, in other contexts, the other entity, may be pre-eminent. A transitive relation is evinced when e.g. $A > B$ and $B > C$ such that necessarily $A > C$, an intransitive relation when $A > B$ and $B > C$ such that $A > C$ necessarily cannot obtain, and a non-transitive relation when whether $A > C$ depends upon the context. A reflexive relation is one that an entity has to itself, an irreflexive relation one that an entity can not have to itself, and a non-reflexive relation one that an entity may or may not have to itself. For substantive examples from Balinese ideology see e.g. Duff-Cooper [1985a; 1988d; 1990a: chap. 4; 1991a; 1991c].

relations may be dynamically expressed as modes of periodicity and they may be reversed or inverted [Duff-Cooper 1986c; 1986d; 1988a].

Different indigenously defined aspects of Balinese life evince different combinations of these principles of order [Duff-Cooper 1988d: 246 Table; 1991a]. The exchanges considered above, looked at from the angles of the parties to them and what each contributes to them, evince the following combinations: asymmetry, irreflexivity, transitivity (exchanges involving *punia*, *daksina*, and "paid" labour); asymmetry, non-reflexivity, transitivity (exchanges at rites at which a Pedanda may or may not officiate); symmetry, reflexivity, transitivity (exchanges of labour, or equipment and animals, and among the holders of a rite).

These principles are all based on Vidhi as Sunya, the Void (in ways explained in [Duff-Cooper 1990b; 1991a; 1991c]). Sunya is a whole of which the two constituent aspects are related perfectly symmetrically, reflexively, and transitively.¹⁸⁾ The aspects are identical one with another and with the whole they constitute. The appearance and reappearance of these principles determine the texture (as it were) of each aspect of Balinese ideology. All these aspects are then constituted as a totality by analogy and homology [Duff-Cooper 1991c].

This totality is clearly more complex than

Lio life which as an instance of the second simplest type of social structure conceivable is based only on duality, asymmetry, and intransitivity [cf. Needham 1987b: 188–192]. While Balinese ideology is less simple, though, it is no less total. This is why like Lio and say Purum life [Needham 1962: chap. 4] it can be treated as a whole and the system in its entirety can be considered [cf. Mauss 1954: 77; sec. I above].

The findings establish two combinations of these principles that earlier analyses have not revealed, the second and third mentioned. They confirm the first. This combination of discovery and confirmation is what was to be expected in the light of what has just been said about the appearance and reappearance of the principles of order. Also, of course, "exchange" is an aspect of Balinese ideology that has not before been considered systematically.

The findings show, usefully, that "equality" and "symmetry" are not synonymous as Sahlin, for instance [1974: 222], has it. The exchanges involving *daksina*, say, are "equal." *Daksina* and what is exchanged for it are conventionally considered to be of equal value, rather as the functions of the four estates are of equal value seen from the angle of sustaining a form of Balinese life [Duff-Cooper 1984a: 498; cf. Boon 1990: 131]. But neither the items the parties exchange nor the parties exchanging them are interchangeable one for another as they would be if the relations between them were symmetrical.

Furthermore, such findings are necessary if a classification of forms of Balinese life is

18) Cf. Hobart [1986: 11]: "Ida Sang Hyang Widi Wasá is arguably Divinity *as* order, what orders" Order is itself life-promoting. Reversal of proper order is associated with misfortune and/or death [e.g. Weck 1937: 39–41].

to be complete and otherwise successful. A recently attempted classification by "geographical" zones [Howe 1989] fails for various reasons: it is restricted to Bali; the postulated zones do not and in many view could not take account of what for Howe are exemplary forms of social organisation; and "equality" is oddly seen as attenuated hierarchy of different degrees, while significant differences in the ideologies lumped together as "egalitarian" are ignored [Duff-Cooper 1990d]. In contrast, the principles can take account of all Balinese social formations; and the definitional and other decisions that the use of words like "equality" and "hierarchy" require of the analyst are very greatly reduced. By reference to instances of the principles in combinations and to historical-cum-formal argumentation [e.g. Duff-Cooper 1990b], a cline of transformations can in principle be established among forms of Balinese life anywhere anywhen.

I am glad to acknowledge that Signe Howell's study [1989], in reminding the analyst of a form of life's exchanges of empirical issues s/he might consider, provided much of the impetus for coming to such revealing and useful findings—even though or, perhaps, because I take issue with it at important points.

Bibliography

Abbreviations

BKI: *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*.

JASO: *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford*.

Adatrechtbundel I 1910. *Rapport over de Regeling*

de agrarische Toestanden op Lombok. 's-Gravenhage: Nijhoff.

Barnes, R. H. 1980. Concordance, Structure, and Variation: Considerations of Alliance in Kédang. In [Fox 1980].

Barth, E. M. 1974. *The Logic of the Articles in Traditional Philosophy*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Belo, Jane. 1953. *Bali: Temple Festival*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Boon, James A. 1990. *Affinities and Extremes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bosch, F. D. K. 1960. *The Golden Germ: An Introduction to Indian Symbolism*. 's-Gravenhage: Mouton.

Bühler, A.; and Others. 1975. *Patola and Geringsing*. Basel: Museum für Völkerkunde.

De Coppet, D. 1981. The Life-giving Death. In [Humphreys and King 1981].

Covarrubias, Miguel. 1937. *Island of Bali*. New York: Knopf.

Duff-Cooper, Andrew. 1984a. Principles in the Classification, the Marriages, and Some Other Relations of a Community of Balinese on Lombok. *Anthropos* 79: 485–503.

———. 1984b. *An Essay in Balinese Aesthetics*. Occasional Paper 7. Centre for South East Asian Studies, University of Hull.

———. 1985a. An Account of the Balinese "Person" from Western Lombok. *BKI* 141(1): 67–85.

———. 1985b. The Family as an Aspect of the Totality of a Balinese Form of Life in Western Lombok. *BKI* 141(2) (3): 230–252.

———. 1985c. Duality in Aspects of a Balinese Form of Life in Western Lombok. *Cosmos* 1: 15–36.

———. 1985d. Ethnographic Notes on Two Operations of the Body among a Community of Balinese on Lombok. *JASO* 16(2): 121–142.

———. 1986a. Balinese Kingship in Pagutan. *Cosmos* 2: 164–181.

———. 1986b. Twins and Transvestites: Two Aspects of the Totality of the Balinese Form of Life in Western Lombok. *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 111(2): 205–229.

———. 1986c. Alternation and Other Modes of Periodicity from a Balinese Form of Life in Western Lombok. *Tonan Ajia Kenkyu* [Southeast Asian Studies] 24(2): 181–196.

———. 1986d. Aspects of the Symbolic Classification of a Balinese Form of Life in Western Lombok. *Sociologus* 36: 121–137.

- _____. 1987a. Incorporation and Alliance among a Community of Balinese in Western Lombok. *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 112(1): 45-69.
- _____. 1987b. Living with the Structure of a Balinese Form of Life in Western Lombok. *Philosophy* 84: 192-226.
- _____. 1987c. The Balinese Rice-planting Rite of *Nuasén* and the Magic Square of Three. *Cosmos* 3: 41-57.
- _____. 1988a. *An Ethnographer of the Balinese Looks at Japan*. Occasional Paper 63. Berlin: East Asian Institute, Free University.
- _____. 1988b. Paradigmatic Scences in Balinese Ideology on Lombok. *Man and Culture in Oceania* 4: 129-151.
- _____. 1988c. The Formation of Balinese Ideology in Western Lombok. *Philosophy* 86: 151-198.
- _____. 1988d. Reflexive Relationships in Aspects of the Ideology of the Balinese on Lombok. *Philosophy* 87: 219-255.
- _____. 1989. Aspects of the Aesthetics of Rice-growing in a Balinese Form of Life on Lombok. *JASO* 20(2): 123-147.
- _____. 1990a. *Shapes and Images*. Denpasar: University of Udayana.
- _____. 1990b. The Formation of Balinese Ideology in Western Lombok: Inspection, Change of Aspect, Assessment. *Sociologus* 40: 133-157.
- _____. 1990c. The Multilingualism of a Balinese Community in Western Lombok. *Anthropos* 85: 329-344.
- _____. 1990d. On Hierarchy, Equality, and Variations in Balinese Social Organisation. *Seitoku University Research Bulletin* 23: 43-54.
- _____. 1990e. Balinese Contests on Lombok: Some Remarks. *Cosmos* 6: 17-27.
- _____. 1991a. Remarks on Systematic Aspects of Forms of Life. *Philosophy* 93.
- _____. 1991b. *Three Essays on Japanese Ideology*. Tokyo: Seitoku University, Occasional Publication.
- _____. 1991c. Analogical Classification in Balinese Ideology in Western Lombok. *Man and Culture in Oceania* 7: 39-61.
- _____. forthcoming-a. Remarks on Balinese Invocations. In [Headley forthcoming].
- _____. forthcoming-b. Prolegomena to Analyses of Change in Aspects of Balinese Life on Lombok. *JASO*.
- Dumont, Louis. 1982. On Value. *Proceedings of the British Academy* 66: 207-241.
- Feyerabend, Paul. 1987. *Farewell to Reason*. London: Verso.
- Fox, James J, ed. 1980. *The Flow of Life: Essays on Eastern Indonesia*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1980. *Negara: The Theatre State in Nineteenth Century Bali*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Gerdin, Ingela. 1981. The Balinese *Sidikara*: Ancestors, Kinship and Rank. *BKI* 137: 17-34.
- _____. 1982. *The Unknown Balinese: Land, Labour and Inequality in Lombok*. Goteborg: Acta Universitatis Goteborgensis.
- Grijns, C. D.; and Robson, S. O. eds. 1986. *Cultural Contact and Textual Interpretation*. Dordrecht and Cinnaminson, N. J.: Foris.
- Headley, Stephen, ed. forthcoming. *Prières et invocations en Asie du sud-est*. Paris: CNRS.
- Hendry, Joy. 1989. To Wrap or Not To Wrap: Politeness and Penetration in Ethnographic Enquiry. *Man* (n.s.) 24: 620-635.
- Hobart, Angela. 1983. Introductory Note. *Indonesia Circle* 30: 4.
- _____. 1986. Creativity in Balinese Theatre. In [Grijns and Robson 1986].
- Hobart, Mark. 1978. The Path of the Soul: The Legitimacy of Nature in Balinese Conceptions of Space. In [Milner 1978].
- _____. 1980a. *The Search for Sustenance: The Peasant Economy of a Balinese Village and Its Cultural Implications*. Denpasar: University of Udayana.
- _____. 1980b. *Ideas of Identity: The Interpretation of Kinship in Bali*. Denpasar: University of Udayana.
- _____. 1983. The Art of Measuring Mirages, or Is There Kinship in Bali? Paper read to the colloquium on cognatic forms of social organisation, University of Amsterdam, March, 1983.
- _____. 1985. *Anthropos Through the Looking-glass, or How to Teach the Balinese to Bark*. In [Overing 1985].
- _____. 1986. A Peace in the Shape of a Durian, or The State of the Self in Bali. Paper read to the colloquium on the Balinese State, University of Leiden, March, 1986.
- Hocart, A. M. 1933. *The Progress of Man*. London: Methuen.

- Hooykaas, Christiaan. 1966. *Surya-Sevana: The Way to God of a Balinese Siva Priest*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- . 1980. *Drawings of Balinese Sorcery*. Leiden: Brill.
- Howe, L. E. A. 1980. Pujung, An Investigation into the Foundations of Balinese Culture. Ph.D. thesis, University of Edinburgh.
- . 1984. Gods, People, Spirits, and Witches: The Balinese System of Person Definition. *BKI* 140: 193–222.
- . 1989. Hierarchy and Equality: Variations in Balinese Social Organization. *BKI* 145: 45–71.
- Howell, Signe. 1989. Of Persons and Things: Exchange and Valuables among the Lio of Eastern Indonesia. *Man* (n.s.) 24: 419–438.
- Humphreys, F. C.; and King, H., eds. 1981. *Mortality and Immortality*. London: Academic Press.
- de Kat Angelino, P. 1920. Het Balische Huwelijksrecht. *Koloniaal Studien* 4: 27–53, 221–248.
- Leach, E. R. 1955. Review of Mauss 1954. *Man* 55: 30, art. 36.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1949. *Les Structures élémentaires de la parenté*. Paris: Mouton.
- Lévy-Bruhl, Lucien. 1910. *Les Fonctions mentales dans les sociétés inférieures*. Paris: Alcan.
- Liefcrinck, F. A. 1900. Slavernij op Lombok. *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 42: 508–538.
- Mauss, Marcel. 1925. Essai sur le don: forme et raison de l'échange dans les sociétés archaïques. *L'Année sociologique* (n.s.) 1: 30–186. (Mauss, Marcel. 1954. *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*. Translated by Ian Cunnison. London: Cohen & West.)
- Milner, G. B., ed. 1978. *Natural Symbols in South East Asia*. London: SOAS.
- Needham, Rodney. 1962. *Structure and Sentiment*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1981. *Circumstantial Deliveries*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press.
- . 1985. *Exemplars*. Berkeley, etc.: University of California Press.
- . 1986. Alliance. *Oceania* 56(3): 165–180.
- . 1987a. *Counterpoints*. Berkeley, etc.: University of California Press.
- . 1987b. *Mamboru: History and Structure in a Domain of Northwestern Sumba*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Overing, Joanna, ed. 1985. *Reason and Morality*. London: Tavistock.
- Parry, J. 1986. *The Gift, the Indian Gift, and the "Indian Gift."* *Man* (n.s.) 21: 453–473.
- Plath, David W. 1964. Where the Family of God is the Family: The Role of the Dead in Japanese Households. *American Anthropologist* 66(1–3): 300–317.
- Ramseyer, Urs. 1975. Geringising. In [Bühler and Others 1975].
- Sahlins, M. 1974. *Stone Age Economics*. London: Tavistock.
- Stephan, M. 1990. *A Transformational Theory of Aesthetics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Swellengrebel, J. L. 1950. Bible Translation and Politeness in Bali. *The Bible Translator* 1: 124–130.
- Weck, W. 1937. *Heilkunde und Volkstum auf Bali*. Stuttgart: Enke.
- Weiner, A. 1980. Reproduction: A Replacement for Reciprocity. *American Ethnologist* 7: 71–84.